

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Advisory Action dated May 25, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this response, claims 1, 5 and 9 have been amended. Claims 14, 17 and 19 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-11 and 15, 16, 18, and 20 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-11, 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2001/0038372 to Lee (hereinafter "Lee"). Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0043178 to Okuzono et al. (hereinafter "Okuzono").

The rejection of claims 1-11, 15, 16, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 14, 17, and 19 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Applicant submits that the rejections to claims 14, 17, and 19 are moot. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-11, 15, 16, 18, and 20 as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the examiner points to claim elements recited in the independent claims 1, 5, and 9. Applicant notes that claims 1, 5, and 9 have been amended to remove the elements pointed to by the Examiner and submits that the amended claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection to claims 1-11, 15, 16, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2001/0038372 to Lee (hereinafter "Lee").

Claims 1-4 each recites a method for driving a liquid crystal display including a combination of elements including "modulating the current most significant bit data in accordance with a difference between the delayed most significant bit data and the current most

significant bit data, wherein the modulated current most significant bit data contains more data bits than do each of the current most significant bit data and the delayed most significant bit data.” Applicant submits that Lee does not disclose at least the quoted combination of elements recited in the claims. Accordingly Applicant submits that Lee does not anticipate claims 1-4.

Claims 5-7 each recites a driving apparatus for a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including “a modulator modulating the most significant bits of data of the n^{th} frame in accordance with a difference between the most significant bits of data for the $(n-1)^{\text{th}}$ frame and the most significant bits of data for the n^{th} frame, wherein the modulated most significant bits of data contain more data bits than do each of the most significant bits data and the $(n-1)^{\text{th}}$ frame and the most significant bits of data for the n^{th} frame.” Applicant submits that Lee does not disclose at least the quoted element recited in the claims. Accordingly Applicant submits that Lee does not anticipate claims 5-7.

Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0043178 to Okuzono et al. (hereinafter “Okuzono”). Applicant notes that claims 12, and 13 have been cancelled and submits that the rejections to claims 12 and 13 are moot.

As discussed above, claim 5 is not anticipated by Lee. Okuzono discloses a liquid crystal display where the polarity of the write signal is inverted every plurality of lines to prevent the occurrence of horizontal stripes. Applicant submits that Okuzono does not cure the deficiencies of Lee with respect to claim 5, and that Lee and Okuzono do not teach each and every element of claim 5. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 8 is allowable over the cited references at least because of its dependency from claim 5.

Claims 9, 10, and 11 each recites a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including “a data modulator modulating most significant bits of the RGB data based on a look-up table storing modulated most significant bits of the RGB data, wherein the modulated most significant bits of the RGB data contain more data bits than do the most significant bits of the RGB data.” Applicant submits that Lee fails to teach or suggest the cited element of claim 9. The Examiner cites Okuzono to cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Lee. Applicant submits that Okuzono does not cure the deficiencies of Lee and that Lee and Okuzono do not teach at least the above quoted element of claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 9, is

allowable over the cited references and that claims 10 and 11 are allowable at least because of their dependencies from claim 9.

Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 26, 2006

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No. 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant